**Analysis of Feb 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps**

(as of 100% due date)

| | |
|---|---|
| Sample Size:<br>(drops excluded) | 88 |
| Total Issuance: | $16,867.00 |
| Total Number Error Cases: | 19 |
| Error Amount Total: | $2102.00 |
| Percentage of Dollars in Error: | 12.46 % |

**********************************

A review of error cases that in the best-case scenario would not be considered errors under the new change reporting waiver shows following results: (this would only be true if the agency estimate at last action was done correctly.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Number Error Cases: | 15 |
| Error Amount Total: | $1780 |
| Percentage of Dollars in Error: | 10.55% |

We had anticipated this change would make a greater impact than this.
Factors:

(1) When only looking at one month it is less likely to be representative of entire year.

(2) The rest of the state excluding Milwaukee had 9 errors in February, 4 of which could be excluded for client non-reporting and which could be considered non-errors under new waiver (none exceeded 130% FPL).

(3) Milwaukee however, had 10 errors, none of which could be excluded as errors under the new waiver. Of the ten**, 6** were due to agency errors in budgeting income at applications and re-certifications; **3** were due to failure to act on reported changes. Only **1** was because of failure to report by a customer and that would still remain an error because the customer exceeded 130% of the FPL with an unreported job.
There are various instances of non-reporting within these cases but they were not the predominant error, and the case would still be in error.

This would indicate a need --at least in Milwaukee—for some intensive training on how to budget earned income, how to use correct earnings verifications, the need to access KIDS at certifications and re-certifications and an overview of what must be re-verified at those times. This is the best way to make effective use of the new waiver. If the information is incorrectly entered at the beginning of a certification no waivers will help.

**Why is February a high error month?**
Comparing February with November 2002, also a high rate month in FSQA, it was not possibly to draw any conclusions as to reasons. Comparing the high months to the low months also gave no clues. . The same profile of error types and causes occurs in most months. It is likely that merely the monthly sample size and "luck of the draw," plus hitting a combination of large dollar-error cases compared to low-issuance correct cases (such as $10 SSI cases) has an effect. It is likely that external factors also contribute to this; one mentioned in the past is that November is usually a high error month—possibly due to school starting in the fall and parents returning to the workforce and not reporting it. Also households move into the state and around the state just prior to beginning of the school year and applications are usually up in September. Large intake schedules could cause more errors. A speculation of course.

**TANF Errors:** Two cases in two counties were almost identical: Each error was $246. W2 participation ended in January. The final W2 payments for those cases were issued on Feb. 1. Neither of those Feb W2 payments were included by CARES in the February FS budget. The reminders on DXBM and such to check for that is not effective. In one of the cases the agency ran SFED twice in one day. The first time it included the TANF, and the second it didn't. It is unreasonable to consider this a worker error. **If we were to expand on the "what if" statistics above, if the two TANF errors hadn't occurred the February error rate would have been further reduced to 7.64%.**
Recommendation: changes to CARES should be made.

**"Biggest Contributors": contributing to the error rate for February (excluding the TANF errors above):**
Selected two:
**(Polk County) - dollar error is $70**.
Failed to verify the client's Child Support income through the KIDS system in December when the person applied for FS. The CS used in CARES budget was from 1998.

**(Milwaukee County) - dollar error is $157.**
Agency worker failed to act on all changes reported on a Change Report form: New address, and father of the two children moving into home. Agency changed the address, but didn't act on adding the new person, along with his SSI income. The agency also didn't act on change of utility obligation at the new residence.

mbw
6/23/03